

FEB 18 1921

GENERAL LIBRARY
FEB 18 1921
UNIV. OF MICH.
The Classical Weekly

Published weekly, on Mondays, except in weeks in which there is a legal or a School holiday, from October 1 to May 31, at Barnard College, New York City. Subscription price, \$2.00 per volume.

Entered as second-class matter November 18, 1907, at the Post Office, New York, N. Y., under the Act of Congress of March 3, 1879.

Acceptance for mailing at special rate of postage provided for in Section 1103, Act of October 3, 1917, authorized on June 28, 1918.

VOL. XIV, No. 15

MONDAY, FEBRUARY 14, 1921

WHOLE No. 384

Classical Associations of Places in Italy*

by FRANCES E. SABIN, Assistant Professor of Latin
at the University of Wisconsin

A collection of approximately 600 passages from Greek and Latin authors arranged under the headings of places in Italy with the best available English translation on the opposite page and explanatory notes at the bottom; also a map at the beginning of the book connecting ancient and modern sites, and various illustrations throughout the text in connection with places mentioned.

PURPOSE OF THE BOOK

The book is designed primarily to meet the needs of the intelligent traveler in Italy who wishes to have at hand in some convenient form the classical associations of the places which he visits. But, apart from the purpose of making a trip to Italy more interesting, the book also serves as a collection of passages which set forth the life and thought of the Romans. It will therefore be a useful book for libraries in general and for departments of the Classics and ancient history in particular.

PUBLICATION AND PRICE

Because of the excessive cost of bringing out a book of this character at the present time, it has not seemed advisable to have a large edition printed or to have it handled in the usual way. The publication will consist of 500 copies which will be ready in May. These may be secured at any time previous to this date by sending subscription pledges to Frances Sabin, 405 N. Henry St., Madison, Wis. Price, \$5.00, postpaid.

A descriptive circular containing among other items comments from various classical scholars who have seen the manuscript will be sent upon request.

*The title of this book has been changed from that given in an advertising circular of recent date, where it appears as

THE ROMANS AND PLACES IN ITALY

*Four Reasons Why***D'Ooge and Eastman's Caesar in Gaul**

is the best equipped text of its kind available.

1. Caesar's life in simple Latin in the early part of the book provides a thorough review of forms and syntax and serves as a stepping-stone to the Gallic War.
2. The direct discourse instead of the indirect in the first two books removes a real obstacle to progress.
3. The combination of text, grammar, and prose lessons makes the book attractive from an economical standpoint.
4. Exceptionally fine maps, battle plans and illustrations vivify the text.

GINN AND COMPANY

70 Fifth Avenue, New York

OVID IS NOW PRESCRIBED by the College Entrance Examination Board

GLEASON'S A TERM OF OVID meets the requirements. The selections given here have been chosen because boys and girls have found them exceedingly enjoyable. Each selection has an introduction, notes, a summary and references to English reading. The present edition makes special provision for sight reading.

GLEASON'S A TERM OF OVID

By CLARENCE W. GLEASON, A.M.

Master of Greek and Latin, Roxbury Latin School, Boston

Cloth 232 Pages Illustrated

AMERICAN BOOK COMPANY

New York

Cincinnati

Chicago

Boston

Atlanta

The Classical Weekly

Entered as second class matter November 18, 1907, at the Post Office, New York, N. Y., under the Act of Congress of March 3, 1879
Acceptance for mailing at special rate of postage provided for in section 1103, Act of October 3, 1917, authorized on June 28, 1918

VOL. XIV

NEW YORK, FEBRUARY 14, 1921

No. 15

SOME ILLUSTRATIONS OF JUVENAL'S THIRD SATIRE

Every reader of THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY will recall the third satire of Juvenal, in which a certain Umbricius, supposed to be an old friend of Juvenal, is represented as setting out with all he owned for Cumae. At the Porta Capena, while his goods and chattels are being stowed away in a single four-wheeler, Umbricius explains why he is leaving his native city. In so doing, he describes the disadvantages and the dangers of life in Rome, for the poor man. The burden of his complaint is, that in Rome honest poor men cannot prosper.

Every one will remember that this satire was closely copied by Doctor Samuel Johnson, in his piece entitled London. It is a pity that the Oxford University Press, for instance, has not made this piece as readily accessible as it has made Johnson's famous, more famous, imitation of Satire 10, entitled Vanity of Human Wishes. In 1896, Mr. E. J. Payne, of Lincoln's Inn, barrister at law, and Fellow of University College, Oxford, edited this piece for the third time, with a brief introduction and explanatory notes.

Juvenal's third satire has always made a powerful appeal to me, for a variety of reasons. Certain passages, I think, I shall never forget. One of these can be found in verses 147-153:

Quid quod materiam praebebat causasque iocorum
omnibus hic idem, si foeda et scissa lacerna,
si toga sordidula est et rupta calceus alter
pelle patet, vel si consuto vulnere crassum
atque recens linum ostendit non una cicatrix?
Nil habet infelix paupertas durius in se
quam quod ridiculos homines facit.

In Pendennis, Chapter XXV, entitled A House Full of Visitors, Thackeray describes a visit paid by "Mr. Pynsent, Lord Rockminster's son, and grandson of the Dowager Lady", and Mr. Wagg, one of my Lord Steyne's toadies, to Mrs. Pendennis and her ward, Miss Laura Bell. I always think of Juvenal when I read the following sentences:

Mr. Wagg, as he entered Fair Oaks premises with his companion, eyed and noted everything. "Old gardener", he said, seeing Mr. John at the lodge—"old red livery waistcoat—clothes hanging out to dry on the gooseberry bushes—blue aprons, white ducks—gad, they must be young Pendennis's white ducks—nobody else wears them in the family. Rather a shy place for a sucking county member, ay, Pynsent?"

... and as the pair walked over the trim gravel, and by the neat shrubberies, up the steps to the hall door, which old John opened, Mr. Wagg noted everything that he saw; the barometer and the letter-bag, the umbrellas and the ladies' clogs, Pen's hats and

tartan wrapper, and old John opening the drawing-room door, to introduce the newcomers. Such minutiae attracted Wagg instinctively; he seized them in spite of himself.

"Old fellow does all the work", he whispered to Pynsent. . . . The next minute the pair were in the presence of the Fair Oaks ladies; in whom Pynsent could not help recognizing two perfectly well-bred ladies, and to whom Mr. Wagg made his obeisance, with florid bows, and extra courtesy, accompanied with an occasional knowing leer at his companion. . . . If there was one thing laughable in Mr. Wagg's eyes, it was poverty. He had the soul of a butler who had been brought from his pantry to make fun in the drawing-room. His jokes were plenty, and his good-nature thoroughly genuine, but he did not seem to understand that a gentleman could wear an old coat, or that a lady could be respectable unless she had her carriage, or employed a French milliner.

In verses 223-227, Juvenal makes the declaration that, in the small towns of Latium, one can buy outright a house for the sum which it costs to rent, for a single year, *tenebrae* at Rome:

Si potes avelli Circensibus, optima Sorae
aut Fabrateriae domus aut Frusinone paratur
quanti nunc tenebras unum conducis in annum.
Hortulus hic puteusque brevis nec reste movendus
in tenuis plantas facili diffunditur haustu.

Chapter XXIX of Pendennis, entitled The Knights of the Temple, begins as follows:

Colleges, schools, and Inns of Court, still have some respect for antiquity, and maintain a great number of the customs and institutions of our ancestors, with which those persons who do not particularly regard their forefathers, or perhaps are not very well acquainted with them, have long since done away. A well-ordained work-house or prison is much better provided with the appliances of health, comfort, and cleanliness, than a respectable Foundation School, a venerable College, or a learned Inn. In the latter place of residence men are contented to sleep in dingy closets, and to pay for the sitting-room and the cupboard, which is their dormitory, the price of a good villa and garden in the suburbs, or of a roomy house in the neglected squares of the town. The poorest mechanic in Spitalfields has a cistern and an abundant supply of water at his command; but the gentlemen of the Inns of Court, and the gentlemen of the Universities, have their supply of this cosmetic fetched in jugs by laundresses and bedmakers, and live in abodes which were erected long before the custom of cleanliness and decency obtained among us.

Unforgettable, surely, is the passage (58-125) in which Juvenal makes Umbricius explain why he cannot endure a *Graeca urbs*. Perhaps the best known part of this passage is contained in verses 74-80:

Ede quid illum
esse putes. Quemvis hominem secum attulit ad nos:
grammaticus, rhetor, geometres, pictor, aliptes,

augur, schoenobates, medicus, magus, omnia novit
Graeculus esuriens; in caelum, iusseris, ibit.
In summa, non Maurus erat neque Sarmata nec Thrax
qui sumpsit pinnas, mediis sed natus Athenis.

Of this passage of Juvenal, Lowell, in the Introduction to *The Biglow Papers*, First Series, made fine use, in speaking of the Yankee character:

New England was not so much a colony of a mother country, as a Hagar driven forth into the wilderness. The little self-exiled band which came hither in 1620 came, not to seek gold, but to found a democracy. They came that they might have the privilege to work and pray, to sit upon hard benches and listen to painful preachers as long as they would, yea, even unto thirty-seventhly, if the spirit so willed it. And surely, if the Greek might boast his Thermopylae, where three hundred men fell in resisting the Persian, we may well be proud of our Plymouth Rock, where a handful of men, women, and children not merely faced, but vanquished, winter, famine, the wilderness, and the yet more invincible *storge* that drew them back to the green isle far away. These found no lotus growing upon the surly shore, the taste of which could make them forget their little native Ithaca.

As want was the prime foe these hardy exodists had to fortress themselves against, so it is little wonder if that traditional feud is long in wearing out of the stock. . . . Thrift was the first lesson in their horn-book, pointed out, letter by letter, by the lean finger of the hard schoolmistress, Necessity. Neither were those plump, rosy-gilled Englishmen that came hither, but a hard-faced, atrabilious, earnest-eyed race, stiff from long wrestling with the Lord in prayer, and who had taught Satan to dread the new Puritan hug. Add two hundred years' influence of soil, climate, and exposure, with its necessary result of idiosyncrasies, and we have the present Yankee, full of expedients, half-master of all trades, inventive in all but the beautiful, full of shifts, not yet capable of comfort, armed at all points against the old enemy Hunger, longanimous, good at patching, not so careful for what is best as for what will do, with a clasp to his purse and a button to his pocket, not skilled to build against Time, but against sore-pressing Need, accustomed to move the world with no *πῶς οὐδὲν* but his own two feet, and no lever but his own long forecast. A strange hybrid, indeed, did circumstance beget, here in the New World, upon the old Puritan stock, and the earth never before saw such mystic-practicalism, such niggard-geniality, such calculating-fanaticism, such cast-iron-enthusiasm, such sour-faced humour, such close-fisted-generosity. This new *Graeculus esuriens* will make a living out of anything. He will invent new trades as well as new tools. His brain is his capital, and he will get education at all risks. Put him on Juan Fernandez, and he would make a spelling-book first, and a salt-pan afterwards. *In coelum, iusseris, ibit*,—or the other way either,—it is all one, so anything is to be got by it.

Long before Juvenal wrote, his idea was set forth by Plautus, in his *Stichus*, 625-627. Gelasimus, the parasitus, is angling for an invitation to dinner from Epignomus, lately returned from a successful trading voyage. At first Epignomus, teasing him, bids him come to dinner, *si artē poteris accubare* (619). The parasitus replies that he needs no more room than a *catellus*. Then, turning serious, and speaking plainly, Epignomus bids Gelasimus go *in carcerem*. The passage continues thus: GE. Quin, si iusseris, eo quoque ibo. EP. Di immortales! Hic quidem pol summam in

crucem cena aut prandio perduci potest. GE. Ita ingenium meumst: quicumvis depugno multo facilius quam cum fame. In a word, Gelasimus is the sort of person that in *Mostellaria* 354-361, Tranio, confronted, now that his older master has come back from his long absence, with the exposure of all his plans and with the punishment he has so richly merited, longs for (in 358 I use, for convenience, Leo's text):

Ecquis homo est qui facere argenti cupiat aliquantum
lucris,
qui hodie sese excrucii meam vicem possit pati?
Ubi sunt isti plagipatidae, feritribaces viri,
vel isti qui hosticas trium nummum causa subeunt sub
falas,
ubi quinis aut denis hastis corpus transfigi solet?
Eo dabo ei talentum primus qui in crucem excucurrerit,
sed ea lege, ut offigantur bis pedes, bis brachia;
ubi id erit factum, a me argentum petito praesentarium.

(To be concluded)

C. K.

HOMER AND THE STUDY OF GREEK

This paper is a continuation of an article, *A Year—or More—of Greek*, contributed to *The Classical Journal* 13.364-371 (February, 1918), in which the writer set forth a few of the more important reasons why the present system of teaching beginners in Greek should be revised to meet modern conditions. The sum and substance of the article was a plea for the abandonment of Xenophon for beginning work, and the substitution of Homer in his place. By this plan the student would be taught Homeric forms and constructions as a basis for future work, and would devote to the study of Homer the time which is now occupied by Xenophon. It is the purpose of the present paper to develop more in detail some of the most important reasons which make such a change desirable.

It is only fair to state that, although this idea of beginning Greek with the reading of Homer is original with the writer, it is not new. This was the regular method employed by the old Romans in teaching their boys Greek, and it was highly commended by that capable and judicious old schoolmaster, Quintilian, as the best possible plan. Since that time it has been used now and then by some of the world's ablest educators and scholars. It was thus that Joseph Scaliger taught himself Greek in Paris; and many more of the great scholars of the past learned their Greek through Homer. Herbart, who began a series of experiments in Switzerland, in 1797, employed this method with marked success in private tutoring. Later, he continued his experiments on a larger scale in the Teachers' Training College at Königsberg, with such good results that he was thoroughly convinced that this was the only suitable method of teaching beginning Greek. At his suggestion it was tried by Dissen, by Ferdinand Ranke, and by Hummel, all of whom were hearty in its praise; and, most important of all, by Ahrens, at Hanover, where it was used for thirty years (1850-1881), with great success, but was finally abandoned because of the lack of suitable text-books and because of the opposition of

other Gymnasia, which refused to adopt such a revolutionary plan. It has also been advocated occasionally, but without success, by other scholars and humanists, notably by Goethe, by Andrew Lang, and by Wilamowitz; but hitherto no systematic series of text-books has been issued which are so well adapted to carry the students through Homer and introduce them to Attic Greek as are the books which have been worked out in connection with Xenophon. It has become highly important that this lack be supplied, if possible, in order that this plan, which has been tried by several with such good success, may be tested on a wider scale, so that we may see whether it will succeed in the hands of the average teacher of beginning Greek. To make a fair test at least two or three text-books must be prepared. First and most important would be a beginner's book, based on Homer, and including suitable grammatical exercises. Next would be required an introduction to Attic Greek, containing a summary of its most important differences in form and syntax from Homeric Greek. These two would be absolutely essential. Additional text-books could be worked out, especially some which would prepare the way for an easier handling of one or more of the simpler plays of Euripides, or of some of the less difficult dialogues of Plato. Thus students would be prepared to strike immediately into the heart of Greek literature, instead of having to go a long way around, as at present.

As to the superiority of Homer over Xenophon, from the standpoint of literary values, and of interest for the average student, there can be no quarrel. It remains for us to investigate the relative advantages and demerits of each as mediums for teaching the language.

In the first place, it is essential that we disabuse our minds of the notion, once prevalent, but long since exploded, though still more or less consciously held by many, that the Attic dialect is the norm by which all other Greek is to be judged. Such an idea is utterly unscientific and ignores completely the modern historical point of view with respect to the development and growth of languages. Any period which has given birth to literary productions of surpassing merit and artistic excellence is justified by its own works; it contains its own linguistic standards and will richly repay those who take the trouble to study it. To call Homeric Greek anomalous and irregular, because it differs in some particulars from the Attic dialect, is as misleading as it would be to say that the language of Shakespeare is immature and eccentric because he does not write the same type of English as does George Ade or Stephen Leacock. As a matter of fact, the language of the Homeric poems is quite as finished, has quite as many virtues, and is quite as much of a norm for its period and style of composition as Xenophon is for his; and the different forms in Homer are no more aberrations on his part than those of Xenophon are marks of degeneracy in him. And Attic Greek, after all, is but one of a number of dialects, coming at neither end, but in the middle of the development, of the Greek language. It is rarely found pure in any

of the great authors, and in none of those who are suitable for beginners.

If we begin with Homer and obtain a good grounding in his language, the transition from that to later Greek is simple and natural and in accordance with well established laws, so that a student who once gets a grasp of the processes involved not only has acquired a valuable scientific point of view, but he might be untrue enough to the traditions of countless students of the past to find Greek grammar interesting.

Since most of us learned our Attic Greek first, when we came to Homeric Greek and found so many different forms, the feeling very naturally arose with many that Homer has many more forms than Attic Greek, and that they are more difficult. On the contrary, the Homeric forms are not only simpler and more transparent than the Attic and as a consequence more easily learned—many Attic forms have to be explained by a reference to the Homeric ones—, but the Homeric forms are considerably fewer in number.

If, for example, we consider the various forms assumed by the case-endings when fused with the stem of the word, we find that, all told, 83 Homeric forms of the noun and the adjective are to be learned, as against 106 Attic forms. But this is not all. Many forms in both Attic and Homeric Greek are so rare that it would be manifestly absurd to compel First Year students to memorize them. When we have omitted such sporadic forms, we find that students who begin with Homeric Greek need to learn only 53 forms as against 78 of the Attic. This means that it is necessary to memorize almost fifty per cent. more forms in order to be able to read the first four books of the *Anabasis* than it would be to read the first six books of the *Iliad*. Furthermore, if the student should not be compelled to memorize any form of the pronoun which does not occur on an average at least once in every two or three thousand verses, there would be fewer Homeric forms to be learned here also. The same is true of the verbs. The reflexive pronoun, for example, and the future passive and future optative of verbs are not found in Homer; the middle voice regularly retains the uncontracted forms of the endings (not in a part only, as in Attic Greek); and in many other ways the forms are simpler and more easily learned. In fact many books for beginners find it easier to teach Attic Greek by a constant reference to the earlier forms, which in many cases are the Homeric.

Many Atticists have maintained that the great number of irregularities in Homeric Greek would be an added difficulty to the beginner. It is true that they are troublesome, but not so troublesome as the considerably greater number of irregularities in Attic Greek. Anyone who will take the trouble to count them will find that the irregular formations in Attic Greek considerably outnumber those in Homer. There is not space here to catalogue the various irregularities, heteroclitics, metaplastic forms, etc., of Attic Greek, but the lists given in Kühner-Blass, or any other of the more elabo-

rate Greek Grammars, are enough to convince the most sceptical.

The whole system of contraction, which is regular at times, and the variations caused by it in the general rules of accent and quantity, all of which are so confusing and so difficult to the ordinary beginner, are so little used in Homer that they can very profitably be omitted, or else touched quite lightly, and the time thus saved can be invested elsewhere to much greater advantage.

In the field of syntax Homer is so much simpler than Xenophon that students ordinarily find him a great deal easier. Thus Homer lacks the articular infinitive; there are no long and involved passages in indirect discourse; many other strange and foreign characteristics of Attic Greek and Xenophon, all of which give a great deal of trouble to the ordinary beginner, are lacking.

That these elements all contribute to a quicker and an easier learning of Greek through Homer has been abundantly proved by experiments. Thus students who begin with Homer regularly read more Greek in the time devoted to him than do those who begin with Xenophon.

It has long been a commonly accepted myth that Homer has such an enormous vocabulary that students would have more than ordinary trouble with it. In fact, however, the vocabulary of Iliad 1-6 is no larger than that required for reading the Anabasis, and one can read the whole of the Homeric poems, including the Hymns, without having to learn many more words than he must learn to read Xenophon, and without having to learn as many words as are necessary for the reading of Plato.

There are, it is true, a great number of words in Homer which are used only once. The Iliad has 1,097 of these, the Odyssey 868, a total of 1,965¹. However, Xenophon has 3,021 such words², of which 433 are in the Anabasis, as compared with 266 (238, if we omit the Catalogue of Ships) in Iliad 1-6.

It is highly important, too, in gaining a vocabulary to learn words which will be used in other authors read later in the course, and to acquire, so far as possible, the more fundamental meanings of words from which their later uses are derived. Ahrens, who made a careful study of this problem, gives the palm to Homer here without question. According to him, the words in Homer are much nearer their fundamental meanings; they take on different shades of significance in the various later authors. If one wishes to obtain a clear grasp of Greek onomatology and semasiology, he should by all means begin with Homer; thus he would be prepared to see more readily the later turns in the meanings of words and phrases, which in many cases vary considerably in authors of the same period, and sometimes even in the same author. There are over 400 words in the Anabasis which either do not occur at all in Xenophon's other works, or are used in them with a

different signification. Rutherford, *The New Phrynichus*, 160 ff., says:

It did not escape the notice of later Greeks that Xenophon's diction was very different from that of pure Attic writers, and there are still extant several remarks upon this point. . . . A busy man, living almost wholly abroad, devoted to country pursuits and the life of the camp, attached to the Lacedaemonian system of government, and detesting the Athenian, Xenophon must have lost much of the refined Atticism with which he was conversant in his youth. It is not only in the forms of words that he differs from Attic writers, but he also uses many terms altogether unknown to Attic prose and often assigns to Attic words a meaning not actually attached to them in the leading dialect.

We may note now the following Tables:

TABLE I

This table indicates the authors whose vocabularies have more words in common with Homer, Iliad 1-6, than with Xenophon, Anabasis entire. The figures show the excess.

Author	Words	Pages	Author	Words	Pages
Hesiod	904	87	Aeschylus	524	309
Pindar	485	236	Sophocles	400	365
Bacchylides	347	73	Euripides	428	916
Elegiac and Iambic Poets	514	160	Aristophanes	148	612
			Theocritus	466	93

TABLE II

This table indicates the authors whose vocabularies have more words in common with Xenophon than with Homer, Iliad 1-6. The figures show the excess.

Author	Words	Pages	Author	Words	Pages
Herodotus	100	799	Isocrates	371	514
Thucydides	371	645	Lucian	119	1,301
Plato	90	2,442	Plutarch	19	5,639
Demosthenes	366	1,379	Menander	176	102
Lysias	362	246	New Testament	209	543

The pages as given above are according to the Teubner texts. The number of words in Xenophon's Anabasis is approximately the same as that in Iliad 1-6.

In these lists, words which are closely enough related to others that ordinary students who know the meaning of one may infer the other are counted but once. Proper names are also omitted.

From these tables it will be seen that Homer is a much better preparation for the Greek drama, Hesiod, the elegiac and iambic poets, than is Xenophon, and it is along these lines that the course should be developed. For Plato the difference is so exceedingly slight that in the matter of vocabulary one is practically as good a preparation as the other, and a few of his easier dialogues should find a place after some of the best poetry has been read. After that the Greek course ought to be able to take care of itself. Herodotus might come at any point. There is a slight advantage here on the side of Xenophon in the matter of vocabulary, but Herodotus's language is so much closer to that of Homer, as

¹L. Friedländer, *Zwei Homerische Wörterverzeichnisse*.

²G. Sauppe, *Xenophon's Opera*, 5.298.

well as his general style and imaginative genius, that he would be very easy and stimulating to those who had read any considerable amount of Homeric Greek. Those who wish to read Thucydides and the orators would find Xenophon's vocabulary somewhat better for their purpose, and the same is true if they wish to read the New Testament and Menander, but in all these the advantage is relatively slight, and in most cases the difference would probably not be noticeable.

Some have urged that, since the bulk of the work in the ordinary College course in Greek is in the Attic dialect, students who begin with this would get a firmer grasp of it than if they began with Homer. Some even feel that a student who did his beginning work in Homeric forms would never be able to feel thoroughly at home in Attic Greek.

Yet few teachers would be rash enough to suggest that, because a student has had a thorough training in Attic Greek, he is thereby disqualified from doing first-class work in the language of the Hellenistic period, nor would many teachers of New Testament Greek object to a student who wished to specialize in their subject, or even in Patristic Greek, if he came to them with a good knowledge of Plato. Students who wish to specialize in Pliny and Tacitus, or even in Medieval Latin, do not find themselves handicapped because they did their earlier work in such authors as Caesar, Cicero, Vergil, Horace, and Catullus. Teachers of the Romance languages also universally recognize that a thorough course in Latin is a prerequisite for the highest type of scholarship in their field, and no student can hope to do advanced linguistic work in any of these languages without a thorough training in Latin. In the same way Homer offers an unexcelled preparation not only for all later Greek literature, but for the later language as well; and instead of the present system of confusion in the teaching of Greek grammar, particularly with reference to the various dialects, some attempt should be made to develop the subject in a more scientific fashion.

Some feel that Homer is too beautiful and too exquisite to be used as a corpus vile for the teaching of Greek grammar. But the fact that he is so beautiful and so exquisite is the very reason why he should be used at this early stage, that the students may have an added incentive for learning their grammar, and may not come to hate and despise the whole subject. Thus they may see, even from the beginning, that Greek is something worth working at, and they may have material so interesting that the necessary grammatical drill will not seem so much useless drudgery.

A highly important consideration in placing Homer before Xenophon in the curriculum is the fact that, as matters now stand, such a large percentage of our students never reaches Homer. The problem before us with regard to these students is whether we are to give them Xenophon or Homer. Since they represent a very large element, not all of whom are loafers, we owe it to ourselves and to the cause of Greek, as well as to them,

to give them that which will be of most lasting value to them.

Furthermore, Homer is interesting not only to older students, but is particularly adapted to the youngest who now take Greek, as the earliest experiments, made with boys from nine to fourteen years of age, have amply demonstrated. He serves the double purpose of introducing them adequately to the language and of furnishing them with reading material as interesting as can be found in any literature, something, too, of permanent value, and he should come by all means as early as possible in the course, that he may serve as a suitable basis for the development of those qualities of taste and appreciation without which the study of art is in vain. And after we have begun with him, we find his treasures inexhaustible. In Herbart's expressive phrase, "Homer elevates the student without depressing the teacher". Again, in his lectures on education, 6.283, he says:

'The reasons for giving the preference to Homer's *Odyssey* in early instruction are well known. Any one who reads the *Odyssey* carefully, with an eye to the various main classes of interest which are to be aroused by education, can discover the reasons. The point, however, to be gained here is not merely to produce a direct effect, but beyond that to get points of connection for progressive instruction. There can be no better preparation for ancient history than gaining interest for ancient Greece by the Homeric stories. The ground is prepared for both the cultivation of taste and the study of languages at the same time. . . .

The *Odyssey*, it is true, possesses no magic power to animate those who are entirely unsuccessful in languages, or who do not work at them seriously; nevertheless it surpasses in definite educative influence, as is proved by the experience of many years, every other work of classic times that could be chosen'.

In conclusion, the writer would earnestly suggest that it is high time that Xenophon be omitted completely from at least the first three years of Greek study. The time and the labor now devoted to both Xenophon and Homer should be spent on Homer alone, and for the three books of the *Iliad* and the four books of the *Anabasis* usually read should be substituted a course in Homer which would be extensive enough to give the students a real insight into his poetry, that they may learn to wander for themselves in the realms of gold, that they may be allowed to become so familiar with his language and his style that reading him will be a pleasure, that they may become so filled with his spirit that they may catch a glimpse of what it means to be Homeric, and, in later years, if they have gone out into other fields and would like to turn back to Greek literature, it would be a comparatively simple matter for them to bring out their old book and enter again with delight into his world of song. In the Secondary Schools we should have a course in Homer comprehensive enough to enable the students to obtain a firm grounding in his language and ideas, instead of the present smattering of both Xenophon and Homer, neither of which the average student knows well enough for it to serve as a stable and satisfactory basis for

future work. It would be a real step forward on the part of the Colleges, and should largely increase the number of those now offering Greek for admission, if the requirements in Greek should be made a requirement in Homer only, due attention being paid to composition and grammar, of course. Thus the Secondary Schools could concentrate their efforts on one dialect and on one homogeneous mass of literature, which would materially simplify their problems, and ought to produce a much higher grade of work than is possible at present. If Colleges would admit students on one, two, and three years, respectively, of Homer, with due credit for each, and reserve all work in the Attic dialect for the College course proper, the Secondary teachers would have their burdens greatly lightened, with a corresponding increase in effectiveness. In no other language do the Secondary Schools undertake to prepare a student in two separate dialects. To do so in Greek is a pedagogical blunder.

CLYDE PHARR.

SOUTHWESTERN PRESBYTERIAN UNIVERSITY,
Clarksville, Tennessee.

REVIEW

Phases of Corruption in Roman Administration in the last Half-Century of the Roman Republic. By Richard Orlando Jolliffe. University of Chicago Dissertation. Menasha, Wisconsin: George Banta Publishing Company (1919). Pp. xi + 109.

The scope of Mr. Jolliffe's study may be clearly seen from the following condensed Table of Contents:

Introduction <ix-xi>.

Chapter I. The Army <1-32>.

1. Great power of Roman general.
2. Embezzlement of the war-chest.
3. Extortion of money from provincials for protection.
4. Quartering of troops: its burdens and vexations. Note on Cic. ad Att. 4.19.2.
5. Requisitions of equipment and supplies.
6. Commissions in army eagerly coveted.
7. Theory that booty belonged to state.
8. Sale of services of Roman army.

Excursus: The 'graft' of centurions in the sale of exemptions and furloughs.

Chapter II. The Navy <33-51>.

1. Burdens of service shifted to allies.
2. Amount of ship-tax left to discretion of governor.
3. <Verres alters> Sicilian system of supplying ships fully equipped, manned and maintained.
4. Embezzlement of pay and maintenance of discharged crews.
5. Sequestration of prize-money.
6. Excessive ship-tax imposed.
7. Sale of a vessel of the fleet to pirates.
8. Naval service used generally by Roman admirals as a source of personal gain.

Excursus: Estimate of Verres' profits from naval graft.

Chapter III. Client Princes <53-76>.

1. Advantage of Roman recognition and support.
2. Pleas for recognition addressed to senate. Bribery of senators.
3. Consuls especially open to corruption of this sort.
4. Provincial magistrates in a favorable position to exact rewards for real or promised support.
5. <Ariobarzanes> debts to Pompey and Brutus probably represent bribes.

6. Corruption of other magistrates.

7. The confiscation of Cyprus.

Chapter IV. Embassies <77-105>.

A: *Legatio Libera*

1. Generally devoted to purposes of gain.
2. Disability involved in time-limit fixed by applicant for the embassy.
3. Used in election campaigning and as a convenient pretext for absence.
4. Efforts at regulation.
5. Hospitality, exacted and voluntary.

B: Embassies and Commissions sent out from Rome.

6. Commissions with extraordinary powers.
7. The *viaticum*.
8. Embassies varied in opportunities afforded for personal profit.
9. Gifts to ambassadors.
10. Prestige of ambassadorship as a means of profit in private transactions.

C: Embassies to Rome.

11. Appeals for favors and relief presented to <senate> by embassies.
12. The consul's prerogative in introducing embassies to the senate.
13. Support of private members of senate and of influential citizens purchased.

Conclusion <107>.

Bibliography <108-109>.

After a glance at the topics the reader will agree with the author's admission in his Preface that, for the epoch under discussion, there is little "hope of making large discoveries or materially altering the general judgment of scholars". For Chapter III, on Client Princes, special indebtedness is acknowledged to P. C. Sands's essay, *The Client Princes of the Roman Empire under the Republic* (Cambridge, 1908), for Chapter IV, on Embassies, to A. A. Thurm's monograph, *De Romanorum Legatis Reipublicae Temporibus ad Exteras Nationes Missis* (Leipzig, 1883).

The purpose of the dissertation, therefore, as expressed in the Preface and in the Introduction (iii, ix), is to investigate the sources and to weigh anew the evidence in order to "illustrate one of the outstanding characteristics of Roman foreign administration". The last half-century of the Republic has been chosen (ix) because "the processes of government exhibit themselves not merely fully developed but already hastening to inevitable revolution", and because the period is "illuminated by a larger body of direct contemporary evidence than we possess for any other period of antiquity".

The author realizes (ix f.) that this evidence, which is, in the main, the political letters, orations, and treatises of Cicero, must be interpreted with allowances for political bias, for concessions to the claims of friendship, for personal rancors, for professional tone. Mr. Jolliffe has his own individual bias, however, in making these allowances. For instance, in §§ 3, 4, 5, 6, 7 of Chapter II, which take up phases of corruption in the navy, the evidence is gathered almost exclusively from the Oration against Verres and is used for more than it is worth; Mr. Jolliffe has admitted (x) that the Orations are not so reliable as the Letters, and explains (39)

that in the case of Sicily Verres's scheme for supplying ships to the government was a reversal of the regular system which had been managed on such principles that it "was bound to be at once economical, efficient and honest". In § 2, on the contrary, where the author deals with the speech in defense of Flaccus, which maintains that the demands of Flaccus upon the cities of his province were not excessive, he calls the plea specious and insupportable, and proceeds, with rather clever but inferential reasoning, to refute every argument that would admit an iota of truth in Cicero's claim. In pages 16 f. he takes at their face value Cicero, Pomp. 64 ff., describing in general terms the oppression of the provincials by armies of Rome and their commanders, but rejects summarily "Cicero's praise of old-fashioned integrity".

Inasmuch as the main purpose of the monograph is, not to set forth new facts, but to illustrate accepted theories, it is surprising to find that there is not a wealth of sound evidence cited to support some theories that have been assumed to be facts. The dissertation is divided into thirty-nine sections. The average length of a section, therefore, is about two and three-quarter pages; several sections, in fact, take up one page or less, and the longest are expanded by argumentation.

Evidence, then, is not copious; neither is it always exceptionally strong. The "only detailed account", in fact the *only* account that is cited for the sale of *vacationes* by centurions is "the picture . . . which Tacitus draws of the demoralization of the imperial army" (19). The sweeping statement that the "pillaging of the unhappy provincials was consistently practised by Roman commanders in their own interest" is supported by one specific reference to Gabinius (Cicero, Pro Sestio 93) and by the general tirade in Cicero's speech for the Manilian Law (65 ff.) in which, the writer admits (21 f.), the "phrasing may be the exaggeration of fervid rhetoric". "Though . . . evidence is more meagre for the navy" than for the army, it is thought "probable that graft and corruption flourished there to an even greater extent" (34). On the strength of a single comment of Servius (on *amandare*, in Vergil, Aen. 3.50), the Senate's "practice" of relegating a *persona non grata* to foreign climes with the privileges of *legatio libera* is considered to have been "commoner than the scanty notices of it would lead one to suspect" (84). Sometimes graft is shown to have been the exception, not the rule. Reference has been made above to the efficient Sicilian system of supplying ships before the arrival of Verres. Likewise in Chapter I, § 8, where the sale of the services of the Roman army to neighboring peoples is illustrated by a detailed account of Gabinius's corrupt dealings in Egypt with Ptolemy the Piper, the narrative is preceded by the statements (23) that "all extra-provincial activities were expressly forbidden by law", and that the law "was so uniformly obeyed" that when "the news reached Rome that Gabinius had accepted an enormous bribe and had restored Ptolemy

. . . to his throne . . . , it created a tremendous sensation".

The monograph is written, on the whole, in clear, readable English. The form is good and the most important references have been conveniently quoted in full in the footnotes. The proof has apparently been carefully read, although stray errors occur in the footnotes.

The most original handling of material is found in the Note on Cicero, Ad Att. 4.19.2, in the two Excursuses, and in the discussions concerning Gabinius and Ptolemy Auletes, Flaccus's administration in Asia, and the negotiations with Ariobarzanes of Cappadocia. In the Note (12 f.) a disputed point in a letter from Cicero to Atticus is interpreted to mean that Caesar gave Quintus Cicero, not an unlimited choice of winter-camps in Gaul for 54-53 B.C., but a choice between several pre-determined locations. For the textual difficulty in the passage Mr. Jolliffe apparently adopts Nipperdey's emendation *hiberna legionis*, for he employs it in his quotation (9), but his footnote (42) is hazy and ambiguous, clouding the decision. In Excursus I (31 f.) it is concluded on the evidence of Tacitus, *Historiae* 1.44-46 that the sale of *vacationes* by centurions was a pernicious system of graft until Otho instituted a reform, compensating the centurions for their loss from his own purse. In Excursus II (49 ff.) it is figured, largely by means of hypothetical and comparative data, that Verres realized, on a conservative estimate, \$41,000 in one year from discharges in the Sicilian squadron and the consequent saving in pay and rations. To this would be added the sum secured by cutting down the rations of the remnant of the crews.

With the material on the Egyptian question Mr. Jolliffe attempts to prove (23 ff.) that in restoring the Piper to his throne Gabinius was a tool of the First Triumvirate under the direct agency of Pompey, and that the triumvirs shared in the enormous bribe which, however, was not paid in full. As to Flaccus, he is painted (35 ff.) as a Verres in Asia, in spite of—if not because of—Cicero's defense of his administration. Cicero's abuse of the Greeks, it is argued, "for daring to prefer serious charges against a noble Roman would, in itself, raise a suspicion that he had a bad case" (35). In regard to Ariobarzanes (64 ff.), it is surmised that the king's great indebtedness to Pompey, and to Brutus possibly, was for monies promised them for their support in the Senate in confirming his title to the throne. True, Cicero declared that the king had received his title *nullo postulante* (Ad Fam. 15.2.8), but Cicero, it is maintained, might have been blinded to the facts because his vanity had been so exquisitely tickled over his appointment as tutor to Ariobarzanes and as governor of Cilicia (71). The argumentation upon these various questions is exceedingly interesting, even ingenious, but there is too much resort to possibility, to probability, to the seemingly obvious, and to *a priori* reasoning. Statements become extravagant and the

conclusions are unconvincing. The case against Gabinius is by far the soundest.

It is convenient to have in a single monograph much of the material that Mr. Jolliffe has collected. His work would be even more valuable and enlightening, if there were a running commentary or a general chapter for comparison with similar practices of the present day. The author promises to present a second paper which shall set forth the corruption in the domestic politics and the judicial administration of the Republic. It will be interesting to see whether he will find a greater bulk of evidence that is not for exceptional or exaggerated cases, or whether he will again have to resort frequently to an obviousness that rests as much on knowledge of modern newspaper scandal as on accurate records of antiquity.

Undoubtedly graft was rampant in ancient Rome. But, considering the amount and the nature of the evidence that is produced in Mr. Jolliffe's dissertation, the reviewer is not yet ready to admit that the "Roman people as a whole . . . showed just as scant recognition of the rights of the provinces as Roman law showed toward the slave" (107). The reviewer is optimistic only in visionary moments as to the maturing of that "growing conception of the responsibilities of office before which rampant individualism, which is the basis of all injustice and corruption, must surely, if slowly, give way to a social conception" (106).

SWARTHMORE COLLEGE. ETHEL HAMPSON BREWSTER.

LUCRETII 1.1-28 AGAIN

Professor Knapp's position with respect to Lucretius 1.1-28 (THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY 14.73) seems to me nearly impregnable. Monro (fourth edition), by the way, sets a period after verses 5, 16, and 20, as well as a colon after verse 5, which disturbs the passage still further.

One or two things occur to me which, on the whole, strengthen Professor Knapp's argument, I think. In 24, *te sociam studeo* is a virtual imperative, equivalent to *es* (or *sis*) *socia*. The only reason actually alleged for asking the goddess to give *lepor* to his verses is the fact that they are to be dedicated to Memmius. Otherwise there is no reason for *magis* in 28, although, in the insistence that his verses must be granted *more* charm since they will appertain to one whom the goddess has decided to honor with perfect and permanent distinction, there is the obvious implication that the poet could not ask for more of something which he did not already have, or expect to have, in *some* measure. But leaving this argument, perhaps rather tortuous, we may fairly say that the demand for *lepor* is hardly suggested in 24, and that he prefers his request in rather back-handed fashion (or is it a clever literary device?).

I tested Professor Knapp's discussion by writing out a sort of skeleton of the argument. This is what I got: (1) 1-5, 'Venus, since thou givest life to all'; (2) 6-20, 'as thus and thus . . . ' (elaboration of the idea, as

a theme in music, after it is 'announced' by some instrument in the orchestra, is taken up, repeated, and varied by others, and so permanently lodged in the consciousness of the hearer); (3) 21-23, 'and since, on the grounds set forth above, we may go so far as to say that "'tis love that makes the world go round"' (*quae quoniam*, 21); (4) 24-25, 'tis thou whose partnership I want in writing about the universe'; (5) 26-28, 'but this poem is to be dedicated to Memmius, and, since he is thy favorite, so much the greater reason is there for thee to lend my words thy grace'.

Does not this dispose of the slight difficulty Professor Knapp felt with respect to *quae quoniam* (21), especially since nowhere else in the passage is *quae* restrictive?

THE LOOMIS INSTITUTE,
Windsor, Connecticut.

J. E. BARSS.

THE AMERICAN ACADEMY IN ROME

Competitions for Fellowships in School of Classical Studies

The American Academy in Rome announces its annual competitions for the Fellowships in Classical Studies. There are two Fellowships of the value of \$1,000 each for one year, and one of the value of \$1,000 for two years. Residence is provided at the Academy free of charge. The awards are made after competitions, which are open to unmarried men and women, citizens of the United States. Entries will be received until March first. For detailed circular giving further particulars apply to the undersigned, Secretary of the Academy, 101 Park Avenue, New York City.

Attention is called to the following General Regulations.

Persons desiring to compete for one of these Fellowships must fill out, in triplicate, a form of application to be obtained from the Secretary, and file it with him not later than March 1. They must submit evidence of attainment in Latin literature, Greek literature, Greek and Roman history and archaeology, also an ability to use German and French. They will be required to present published or unpublished papers so as to indicate their fitness to undertake special work in Rome.

The Fellows will be selected without examination, other than the submission of the required papers, by the Fellowship Jury.

Fellows in Classical Studies will be required to engage in some piece of special research during the term of their Fellowship, and to publish the results of their investigations, as the Academy may direct.

ROSCOE GUERNSEY,
Executive Secretary.

In THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY 14.49, at the beginning of Professor Knapp's article on The Love of Nature in Vergil: I, a most illuminating list is given of Englishmen not primarily classical scholars who have done distinguished work in the classical field. I was surprised at one omission—that of Benjamin Bickley Rogers, the great editor and translator of Aristophanes, who, though he was by profession a barrister, and in no sense of the term a professional scholar, has nevertheless produced the most successful versions in the English language of the comedies of Aristophanes.

UNIVERSITY MUSEUM, STEPHEN BLEECKER LUCE.
University of Pennsylvania.